

## Who are and Who are not Entitled to Bounty Under Existing Laws.

As we are constantly in receipt of inquiries concerning Bounties, we publish the subjoined remarks for the information of our readers, who are advised to paste the same in their scrap-books, for ready reference, provided they do not keep a regular file of the paper:

**CLASS 1.** Those who enlisted in the Army for THREE years between May 4, 1861 and July 22, 1861, and who were actually mustered into the United States service prior to August 6, 1861, and who were discharged on account of disease contracted in the line of duty, and musicians enlisted as above and discharged by reason of discontinuance of bands, before a service of two years, are entitled to \$100 bounty, provided they have not received the same. (See Act April 23, 1872.)

Remarks: This class are not entitled to the ADDITIONAL bounty provided by the act of Congress approved July 28, 1866.

Heirs are not entitled to this Bounty, nor are soldiers who were discharged on account of a disability which existed at time of enlistment.

**CLASS 2.** Those who enlisted in the Army for either two or three years between April 12, 1861 and October 24, 1863, in old regiments (those which had already left the State) and those who enlisted for a term of two or three years between April 12, 1861 and December 24, 1863 in new regiments (those which had not left the State) and those who enlisted between April 1, 1864 and July 18, 1864, become entitled to \$100 bounty provided they served two full years as ENLISTED MEN or were discharged by reason of WOUNDS, OR INJURIES IN THE NATURE OF WOUNDS, incurred while in the line of duty, or on account of Government no longer requiring their services or by reason of expiration of term of enlistment.

Remarks: Men of this class discharged before full two years' service to accept commissions forfeit the bounty; also those who were discharged by reason of a disability which existed at time of enlistment, or by reason of minority, by way of favor, or dishonorably.

Heirs of soldiers of this class who die in the service are entitled to this bounty, provided they have not received the same.

This class, and this class only, are entitled to the additional bounty act of July 28, 1866.

**CLASS 3.** Those who enlisted after July 18, 1864, were promised a bounty of \$100 for one (1) year, \$200 for two (2) years, and \$300 for three (3) years. This bounty was due and payable as follows: One-third at the muster-in; one-third at the first regular pay-day after serving one-half the term of enlistment and the remaining one-third at the expiration of term of enlistment.

Remarks: A soldier who did not serve one-half of his term of enlistment did not become entitled to the second installment of this bounty and the third installment did not become due unless he served out his full term or was discharged on account of a wound. If discharged by reason of a DISEASE the unaccrued installments were forfeited. This class are not entitled to the additional bounty provided by the act of July 28, 1866.

Promotion to the grade of commissioned officers cut off the unaccrued installments of bounty.

**CLASS 4.** Those who enlisted for a period of three (3) years between October 24, 1863 and April 1, 1864 in old regiments (those already in the field) and those who enlisted in new regiments (those which had not left for the field) between December 24, 1863 and April 1, 1864, became entitled to bounty as follows: \$60 advance at time of muster-in; \$40 when two (2) months had been served; \$40 after six (6) months service; \$40 after twelve (12) months service; \$40 after eighteen (18) months; \$40 after twenty-four (24) months service and \$40 at the expiration of term of enlistment, making a bounty of \$300.

Remarks: Heirs of soldiers of this class who die in the service are entitled to the installments remaining unpaid at the date of the soldier's death.

This class are not entitled to the additional bounty-act of July 28, 1866.

Promotion to the grade of commissioned officer cuts off the unaccrued installments.

Those of this class discharged by reason of disease are not entitled to the unaccrued installments; but if discharged on account of a wound or injury in the nature of a wound, or by reason of services being no longer required, or on account of expiration of term of enlistment, they became entitled to the full \$300 bounty. Those discharged on account of a disability which existed at time of enlistment, or by way of favor, or by reason of minority, or dishonorably, have no title to this bounty.

**CLASS 5.** Those who, after having rendered full nine (9) months' continuous service in the army, after April 12, 1861, received an honorable discharge, and afterwards re-enlisted in another organization for three years, between January 1, 1863, and April 1, 1864, (enlistments in the Veteran Reserve Corps excepted,) are, if not already mustered as veteran volunteers, entitled to be placed on the rolls of the regiment in which they enlisted the second time as VETERAN VOLUNTEERS. Such change of record would entitle them to a further bounty of \$100 or \$200, or less, according to the date of their second enlistment and the period of actual service.

Heirs of this class can effect a veteran muster and recover the further bounty.

**CLASS 6.** Drafted men and substitutes for men who had actually been drafted, who entered the service for a term of THREE YEARS between March 3, 1863, and September 5, 1864, became entitled to \$100 bounty, provided they served two full years as enlisted men, or were discharged on account of wound or injury, or by reason of close of war or expiration of time of service.

**CLASS 7.** Those embraced in CLASS 2 became entitled to \$50 or \$100 ADDITIONAL bounty, (Act of July 28, 1866,) according to whether term of enlistment was for two or three years, PROVIDED they have not received, nor are entitled to receive, a greater bounty than \$100 for all service. The receipt of United States bounty in excess of \$100 excludes from the benefits of the ADDITIONAL BOUNTY ACT OF JULY 28, 1866.

Heirs of soldiers of this class who died in the service are entitled to this bounty.

This class have no title to the additional bounty, act of July 28, 1866.

**GENERAL REMARKS:** An uncancelled charge of desertion on the muster rolls is a bar to the payment of any bounty. The charge must be removed before bounty can be collected.

DISHONORABLE DISCHARGE carries with it forfeiture of bounty, as well as pay and other allowances.

Those who enlisted for ONE HUNDRED DAYS, or for THREE, SIX, or NINE MONTHS, are not entitled to bounty for such enlistments, nor are those who enlisted for ONE YEAR PRIOR TO JULY 18, 1864.

Those who were drafted for one year, and their substitutes, are not entitled to bounty.

No bounty has been provided for those who enlisted into the Navy or Marine Corps prior to July 18, 1864. Enlistment after that date brings them in CLASS 3.

Any person can, by a careful perusal of the foregoing remarks (unless there is some peculiarity connected with his case) determine whether he is entitled to any further bounty.

The Equalization Bounty Bill now before Congress proposes to grant eight and one-third dollars bounty for each month of service, deducting all United States bounty heretofore paid. Eight and one-third dollars bounty is equal to \$100 bounty a year. Any of our readers who desire to learn the amount of bounty to which they will be entitled should the Equalization Bill become a law should multiply the number of months of actual service by eight and one-third dollars, and from the product subtract the amount of bounty already received from the United States. The remainder will show the amount they will be entitled to receive if the bill becomes a law.

## Allen G. Thurman on the Commissioner's Sixty Surgeon Bill.

Whether one approves the political notions of the Ohio Senator or not no man doubts the clearness of his intellect and his talent for grappling a question and stating his position for or against it.

We reprint from the *Record* of March 1, 1879, some extracts from his remarks, which completely demolish the whole fabric of this bill, and we call attention to them as specially worthy of consideration.

This amendment provides that the United States shall be divided into districts, not more than sixty in number. The whole United States are to be divided into districts not exceeding sixty in number, and into each one of these districts are to be sent a lawyer and a doctor, who constitute a board to examine the applicants or the pensioners, and to take testimony. Now let us see what kind of a district they will have. We have thirty-eight States and nine Territories, and the District of Columbia. That makes in round numbers, according to territory, for presences, thirty-eight States and ten Territories—forty-eight in all, and you are to have not exceeding sixty districts. What is the consequence? The consequence is, a district will be almost as large as a State.

I have heard of Kentucky troops that fought on our side; I have heard of troops from Tennessee that fought on our side; I have heard of even troops from Arkansas that fought on our side. So I think the Senator will find that his districts will be, as I say, each one of them almost as large as a State. Now, I will take the State of Ohio. These two gentlemen come into the State of Ohio with eighty-eight counties in the State, and not one single county in the State in which there is not a pensioner. I am quite safe in saying that. Where are they to hold their sittings and discharge this duty in the time that is specified, and how are these pensioners all to get notice? By publication in a newspaper in the district. The district may comprise sixty counties in Ohio, and this would not be more than a fair average size for each one of the districts; and in some one newspaper in that district there is to be a notice that this board will sit. Sit where? Sit for the examination of whom? It seems to me that it would be utterly impracticable for them to discharge this work, to perform this duty.

But that is not all. I doubt exceedingly the propriety of appointing these surgeons, because I believe that under the present system the examination made by surgeons in the neighborhood of the man who is under disability or has been wounded is much more likely to result in a correct opinion than would be an examination made by a surgeon who sees the man for half an hour, never saw him before, and never will see him again. There is no trouble when a man has lost an arm or lost a leg or lost an eye; it requires no surgeon to see that. But when a man is under a disability resulting from disease, how is this surgeon, sent perhaps from Washington City or detailed from the Army or Navy, and seeing a man for half an hour whom he had never seen before and with whose habits he is wholly unacquainted, to form a correct opinion of that man at all comparable with the surgeon in his neighborhood who has known him well and is competent to form a judgment about him? I do not think it can be done. I think the present system in that respect is better, especially when the appointment of the examining surgeon rests with the Commissioner of Pensions.

Sir, I know some of these examining surgeons of my State, and every one of them whom I know is a man of high honor, of high standing in his profession. There is not one of them that would give a false certificate, much less one of them that could be corrupted to give a false certificate. They are just as good men as these sixty men would be under this bill, and that, Mr. President, I take it is a much more economical plan, if I am right. Here are to be sixty lawyers and sixty doctors, and they are to receive \$2,500 apiece each year. That makes \$5,000 for the two in each district. Multiply that by sixty, the number of districts, and you have \$300,000 to be annually paid to these lawyers and these doctors. It may be that that would be a wise expenditure, it may be that it would result in economy, but at first sight it does not look so to me.

## Smallest Tea Set in the World.

Mr. W. H. Riland, who now keeps a store in the city of Reading, Pa., was wounded in one of the battles of the last war. It took him a long time to get well of his wound, and he passed the tedious hours sitting up in bed and whittling on peach kernels with a pen knife. He concluded one day to make a tea-set out of the kernels. He whittled out one of the tiniest, cutest set of dishes in the world—a tea pot, cups, saucers, sugar-bowl, and everything, even to knives and forks. He has the set still, and though he has been offered as high as \$40 for it, says that he will never sell it for any price.

## The Opinion of an Eminent Jurist.

Hon. George F. Edmunds stands as the peer of any man in the Senate for ability and integrity, and the following are some of his views on the Bentley Bill:

\* \* \* \* \* Mr. President, I wish to deny for the pensioners who reside in the State of Vermont and as far as I know for the pensioners residing in all the other States, the imputation that 25 per cent. or 15 per cent. or 10 per cent. or anything like it are in the slightest degree fraudulent, and I should like to see the proof of it. I should like to know what the nature of the proof is. The statute that has existed all the time under our pension laws authorizes the Commissioner of Pensions either with or without the approval of the Secretary of the Interior—I do not remember which nor care for this purpose—when ever he has reason to believe any one pension is not legally payable, to stop the payment of it. He therefore has held all the time in his own hands the power of stopping the payment of any pension that he believed to be an unjust or a fraudulent one. Why does he not? If he has the evidence which satisfies him that 10 per cent., which I believe is his statement, of the pensions that are paid are fraudulent, why does he not stop that 10 per cent., or why does not somebody, because the evidence of fraud cannot be found by any general impression; it must be found by an aggregation of individual instances. \* \* \* \*

The fact that he has discovered \$500,000 does not prove that he could discover a million, any more than the fact that you can find that one Senator in this body in years gone by has been guilty of misconduct or fraud implies that probably there are ten or fifteen more just as guilty and you are therefore to institute measures to purge the Senate. No such inference follows by any means; and hence I say that if the Commissioner of Pensions is justified in saying to us that there are 10 per cent. or 5 per cent. or 3 per cent. of these payments of pensions that are fraudulent or unjust, he must, if he is wise and if he is honest in his report, have based that upon the information that he has as to individual cases; and as fast as he has that information, it is within his authority, and it is duty, to stop the payment of pensions, as he does as far as he goes. We are jumping, therefore, at conclusions, and I think very unjustly to the body of the patriotic soldiery of this country when we give it forth to everybody and everywhere by iterated and reiterated statements that a very large percentage of the pensioners of this Government during the late war are mere fraudulent plunderers of this Government. I do not believe any such thing, and I do not believe there is any proof of any such thing; but because the Commissioner of Pensions has found here and there a case of fraud he asks us to presume, as he presumes himself, that there must be a much larger number more, just as I said a little while ago if we find once in twenty years that there is one Senator in this high body who has been guilty of receiving bribes, therefore it is to be presumed if you only had more stringent methods you would find all the rest or a certain proportion, 10 or 15 per cent., guilty. I deny the logic and I deny the justice of any such inference.

"It is an amendment which will carry terror into the whole ranks of two hundred and thirty thousand men."

[Extract from Senator Thurman's great speech on Bentley's Sixty Surgeon Bill.]

## Military Strength of the United States.

The new edition of the Encyclopedia Britannica, under the article "Army," has the following:

The military history of the United States is as strange as the rise and rapid growth of the nation. In 1790 the rank and file of the army, as fixed by act of Congress, amounted to 1,216 men, and in 1814 an English expedition of only 3,500 men was able to seize and burn Washington, the capital of a country which even then numbered 8,000,000 inhabitants. In 1861, at the commencement of the war of the secession, the whole regular force amounted to only 14,000 men. In April of that year the President called out 75,000 volunteers for three months to defend the capital, which was threatened; and in May a further call for 42,000 was made. In July two calls for 500,000 each were authorized by Congress, and, as even this vast force proved insufficient for the gigantic struggle which America had now embarked in, it was found necessary to introduce the conscription. In October, 1863, a levy of 300,000 men was ordered, and in February, 1864, a further call of 500,000 was made. Finally, in the beginning of 1865, two further levies, amounting in all to 500,000 men, were ordered, but were only partially carried out, in consequence of the cessation of hostilities. The total number of men called under arms by the government of the United States, between April, 1861, and April, 1865, amounted to 2,759,049, of whom 2,653,053 were actually embodied in the armies. If to these be added the 1,100,000 men embodied by the Southern States during the same time, the total armed forces reaches the enormous amount of nearly 4,000,000, drawn from a population of only 32,000,000—figures before which the celebrated uprising of the French nation in 1793, or the recent efforts of France and Germany in the war of 1870-'71 sink into insignificance. And within three years the whole of those vast forces were peacefully disbanded, and the army had shrunk to a normal strength of only 30,000.

A LADY contributor tells this story: "I had been out in Westchester County on a visit, and while there I found a kitten, which I brought as a plaything for my two children. To prevent any dispute about the ownership of puss, I proposed, and it was agreed, that the head should be mine, the body should be the baby's, and Eddy, the eldest, but three years, should be the sole proprietor of the long and beautiful tail. Eddy rather objected at first to this divisions, as putting him off with an extremely small share of the animal, but soon became reconciled to the division, and quite proud of his ownership in the graceful terminus of the kitten. One day soon after I heard poor puss making a dreadful mewing, and called out to Eddy: 'There, my son, you are hurting my part of the kitten; I heard her cry.' 'No, I didn't, mother; I trod on my part and your part hollered.'"